

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00197 051416Z

51

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 025071

O 051300Z MAY 75

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2599

INFO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 0197

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: DRAFT NAC STATEMENT FOR MAY 7 CONSULTATION

(SALT TWO-648

REF: SALT TWO 647 (USDEL SALT TWO 196)

1. REQUEST ADDRESSES DISREGARD DRAFT CONTAINED REFTEL AND
SUBSTITUTE THEREFORE THE FOLLOWING TEXT:

BEGIN TEXT:

DRAFT STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL, MAY 7, 1975

I

1. I AM PLEASED TO MEET WITH YOU ONCE AGAIN TO CONTINUE
OUR REGULAR CONSULTATIONS ON SALT. AS YOU MAY KNOW, THE UNITED
STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION HAVE AGREED ON A BRIEF WORKING RECESS,
TO LAST FROM MAY 8 UNTIL THE FIRST WEEK IN JUNE. OUR LAST PLENARY

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00197 051416Z

SESSION PRIOR TO THE RECESS WAS HELD THIS MORNING.

2. TODAY I WILL DISCUSS WITH YOU THE DEVELOPMENTS IN GENEVA SINCE AMB. BRUCE CIRCULATED HIS LETTER REPORT ON SALT TO THE COUNCIL ON APRIL 4. I WILL ALSO COVER IN SOMEWHAT MORE DETAIL THAT WAS DONE IN THAT REPORT THE EVENTS THAT OCCURRED PRIOR TO APRIL 4.

II

3. IN MY LAST APPEARANCE HERE ON FEB. 24, I OUTLINED THE MAIN ELEMENTS OF THE SOVIET DRAFT TEXT OF FEB. 1. I WILL NOW DESCRIBE THE PRINCIPAL POINTS OF THE U.S. DRAFT TEXT WITH THE U.S. DELEGATION TABLED ON MAR. 5. FIRST, I WOULD POINT OUT THAT OUR DRAFT IS SOMEWHAT MORE DETAILED THAN THE SOVIET DRAFT. OUR TEXT IS A SELF-CONTAINED DOCUMENT, AS OPPOSED TO THE SOVIET TEXT WHICH IN A NUMBER OF INSTANCES REQUIRES REFERENCE TO OTHER DOCUMENTS IN ORDER TO BE UNDERSTOOD.

4. YOU WILL RECALL THAT UNDER THE VLADIVOSTOK UNDERSTANDING OF NOV., 1974, THE U.S. AND SOVIET UNION AGREED THAT EACH SIDE WOULD BE PERMITTED TO DEPLOY AN EQUAL NUMBER--2,400-- OF STRATEGIC DELIVERY SYSTEMS, I.E. ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS AND HEAVY BOMBERS, AND AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILES (ASM) OF RANGES OVER 600 KMS IF DEPLOYED ON BOMBERS. THE U.S. INTERPRETATION OF THIS PROVISION IS THAT ONLY BALLISTIC ASMs ARE TO BE INCLUDED AND CRUISE MISSILES ARE NOT. ACCORDINGLY, THE U.S. DRAFT CONTAINS A BASIC PROVISION LIMITING ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS, HEAVY BOMBERS AND AIR-TO-SURFACE BALLISTIC MISSILES (ASBM) OF RANGES OVER 600 KMS IF DEPLOYED ON BOMBERS, TO AN AGGREGATE NUMBER NOT TO EXCEED 2,400. WE HAVE EMPHASIZED THROUGHOUT THE NEGOTIATIONS OUR POSITION THAT, ON THE BASIS OF ITS CAPABILITIES, THE BACKFIRE IS A HEAVY BOMBER. IN ADDITION THE DRAFT SETS FORTH RELEVANT DEFINITIONS, INCLUDING THOSE FOR THE WEAPONS SYSTEMS IN THE 2,400 AGGREGATE, FOR A MIRV SYSTEM, AND FOR A HEAVY ICBM. THE DEFINITION OF A HEAVY ICBM IS BASED UPON VOLUME AND THROW-WEIGHT. THE DRAFT ALSO CONTAINS RULES SPECIFYING WHEN AND HOW EACH SYSTEM WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE AGGREGATE. THE DRAFT INCLUDES THE BASIC 1,320 AGGREGATE LIMIT ON LAUNCHERS FOR ICBMS AND SLBMS EQUIPPED WITH MIRV SYSTEMS, AS WELL AS MIRVED ASBMs. DETAILED PROVISIONS RELATING TO MIRV VERIFICATION ARE SET FORTH IN A PROTOCOL.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00197 051416Z

5. OUR DRAFT ALSO CONTAINS PROVISIONS CARRYING OVER THE SUBSTANCE OF ARTICLES I AND II OF THE INTERIM AGREEMENT--THAT IS, A BAN ON CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL FIXED ICBM LAUNCHERS AND A BAN ON CONVERSION OF LAUNCHERS FOR "NON-HEAVY" ICBMS TO LAUNCHERS FOR "HEAVY" ICBMS. IT ALSO CONTAINS A PROVISION TO LIMIT THE MAXIMUM VOLUME AND THROW-WEIGHT OF "HEAVY" ICBMS. THE DRAFT CONTAINS A PROVISION FOR NEGOTIATIONS ON REDUCTIONS TO

BEGIN AS SOON AS PRACTICABLE FOLLOWING ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE AGREEMENT. FINALLY, IT CONTAINS ARTICLES RELATIVE TO NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS OF VERIFICATION AND TO THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE STANDING CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION AS WELL AS STANDARD PROVISIONS ON AMENDMENTS AND WITHDRAWAL.

6. THE SOVIET SIDE HAS OPPOSED THOSE SUBSTANTIVE PROVISIONS OF THE U.S. TEXT WHICH DO NOT CORRESPOND TO THEIR INTERPRETATION OF THE VLADIVOSTOK UNDERSTANDING. FOR EXAMPLE, THEY PROPOSE THAT SYSTEMS TO BE COUNTED WITHIN THE 2,400 AGGREGATE INCLUDE AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILES (ASMS) OF "ANY TYPE", NOT JUST AIR-TO-SURFACE BALLISTIC MISSILES. ADDITIONALLY, THEY PROPOSE A BAN ON EQUIPPING AIRCRAFT OTHER THAN BOMBERS WITH ASMS HAVING A RANGE OF MORE THAN 600 KILOMETERS. THEY HAVE OPPOSED ANY DEFINITION OF A "HEAVY" ICBM, AS WELL AS THE UPPER LIMIT ON THE VOLUME AND THROW-WEIGHT OF "HEAVY" ICBMS. THEY HAVE REJECTED A NUMBER OF U.S. PROPOSED PROVISIONS RELATING TO MIRV VERIFICATION. THEY HAVE ALSO MAINTAINED THEIR POSITION THAT BACKFIRE IS A MEDIUM BOMBER AND SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE AGGREGATE.

III

7. AS WE ANTICIPATED, THE PROBLEM OF VERIFICATION OF THIS COMPLEX AGREEMENT, PARTICULARLY AS IT RELATES TO MIRVS, HAS DEVELOPED AS A MAJOR ISSUE OVER THE LAST THREE MONTHS. IN THIS REGARD, OUR POSITION CONTINUES TO BE THAT VERIFICATION MUST BE THROUGH NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS; BUT, AS I NOTED HERE IN FEBRUARY, THE NEW AGREEMENT WILL BE BROADER AND MORE COMPLEX, AND THEREFORE WE HAVE MAINTAINED THAT IT MUST CONTAIN PROVISIONS WHICH ASSURE THAT NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS CAN IN PRACTICE ADEQUATELY VERIFY COMPLIANCE WITH THE AGREEMENT.

WE HAVE POINTED OUT TO THE SOVIETS IN BOTH FORMAL AND INFORMAL MEETINGS THE PROBLEMS WHICH WE PERCEIVE IN THIS AREA. THE SOVIETS ON
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 SALT T 00197 051416Z

THEIR SIDE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT ANY SPECIAL PROVISIONS ARE REQUIRED TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS, BUT THEY HAVE BEEN WILLING TO DISCUSS THE MATTER. SEVERAL APPROACHES HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED, BUT NONE HAS BEEN AGREED. THUS THIS MATTER IS STILL IN A PRELIMINARY STAGE AND IT WOULD NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR ME TO GO INTO THE MATTER IN MORE DETAIL AT THIS TIME.

IV

8. AS YOU KNOW, THE VLADIVOSTOK UNDERSTANDING DID NOT INCLUDE ANY LIMITATIONS ON SO-CALLED "FORWARD BASED SYSTEMS" (FBS). NEITHER WAS THERE ANY MENTION OF THIRD-COUNTRY NUCLEAR FORCES.

9. HOWEVER, AS I PREVIOUSLY INFORMED YOU, THE FEB. 1 SOVIET DRAFT TEXT CONTAINS A PROVISION THAT THE SIDES SHOULD "IN THE

NEAR FUTURE" CONSIDER THE QUESTION OF REDUCING FBS, AS WELL AS QUESTIONS "RELATED TO THE EXISTENCE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THIRD COUNTRIES". ON MAR. 21, I FORMALLY ADVISED THE SOVIETS THAT IT WAS THE POSITION OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT THAT THIS PROPOSAL WAS INCONSISTENT WITH THE VLADIVOSTOK ACCORD AND THAT WE COULD NOT AGREE TO ITS INCLUSION IN THE NEW AGREEMENT.

10. THE NON-TRANSFER PROVISION OF THE SOVIET DRAFT PROVIDES THAT THE SIDES WOULD UNDERTAKE NOT TO TRANSFER STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS TO OTHER STATES, AND WOULD NOT ASSIST IN THEIR DEVELOPMENT, IN PARTICULAR, BY TRANSFERRING COMPONENTS, TECHNICAL DESCRIPTIONS OR BLUEPRINTS FOR THOSE ARMS. AS IN THE PAST, WE HAVE TOLD THE SOVIETS THAT WE CANNOT CONSIDER A NON-TRANSFER CLAUSE UNTIL THE OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE AGREEMENT HAVE BEEN DECIDED AND IT IS CLEAR AS TO EXACTLY WHAT SYSTEMS ARE TO BE LIMITED.

11. A U.S./SOVIET DRAFTING GROUP HAS COMPLETED A PRELIMINARY JOINT TEXT, WHICH WAS TABLED BY BOTH SIDES AT THE PLENARY SESSION THIS MORNING. ALTHOUGH THERE HAS BEEN NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGE IN THE SUBSTANTIVE POSITIONS OF THE SIDES, THIS DRAFTING WORK HAS BEEN USEFUL IN RESOLVING DIFFERENCES OF APPROACH AND FORM, AS WELL AS IN DEFINING AND REFINING THE SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES.

12. THIS CONCLUDES MY FORMAL PRESENTATION AND I WILL BE GLAD TO RESPOND TO ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 05 SALT T 00197 051416Z

END TEXT.

JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: SALT (ARMS CONTROL), ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 MAY 1975
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975SALTT00197
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750156-1046
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750580/aaaacvvm.tel
Line Count: 204
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: 75 SALT TWO 647, 75 (USDEL SALT TWO 19
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 23 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <23 APR 2003 by GarlanWA>; APPROVED <24 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DRAFT NAC STATEMENT FOR MAY 7 CONSULTATION (SALT TWO-648
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006